

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given to the present application. Claims 1-25 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the application in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 and 15-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zicker (U.S. Pat. No. 5,995,833 hereinafter Zicker) in view of Moore (U.S. Pat. No. 5,450,617 hereinafter Moore). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note independent Claim 1 has been amended to include "wherein each of the network access points is configured to transmit signals to and receive signals from a portable electronic device within a cell area on a mobile platform, and is further configured to transmit signals to and receive signals from a portable electronic device roaming into the cell area on the mobile platform from a cell area on the mobile platform associated with another of the access points." Applicants respectfully submit this feature is not taught nor suggested by Zicker or Moore, or the combination of both.

Zicker appears to disclose the roaming of a cell phone user between his home system and a remote system on the vehicle of Zicker. It does not teach nor suggest whatsoever the user's device roaming between spaced apart access points on the same vehicle as claimed.

Moore further fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed. As such, Applicants respectfully assert Claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, Claims 2-11 and 15 which depend from independent Claim 1 are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

With regard to independent Claim 16, Applicants note this claim has been amended to include "enabling wireless access to a wide area network." Applicants submit support for this amendment can be found in Applicants' specification as filed. Applicants also submit Zickwer and Moore fail to teach or suggest this feature as claimed. In particular, Zicker appears to disclose an airborne cell phone network and not a wireless local area network for a mobile platform which "enables wireless access to a wide area network." Moore further fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants assert independent Claim 16 is patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as Claims 17-22 depend from independent Claim 16, they are also believed to be patentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Zicker and Moore in view of Wright (U.S. Pat. No. 6,047,165 hereinafter Wright). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note Claims 8 and 9 both depend from independent Claim 1. As stated previously, Applicants believe Claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claims 8 and 9 are also patentable and in

condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 22, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zicker in view of Wright. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note independent Claim 23 includes “using a direct sequence spread spectrum transmission technique.” Applicants respectfully assert this is not taught nor suggested by either Zicker or Wright.

Zicker, as noted by the Examiner, fails to teach using direct sequence spectrum transmission, but rather AMPS or amplitude modulation. Wright appears to disclose “frequency hopping spread spectrum modulation” transmissions which are substantially different from “direct sequence spectrum transmissions.” Furthermore, Wright appears to teach the use of his invention external to the aircraft to link the aircraft to a ground-based network. Applicants, on the other hand, claim transmissions to “at least one user portable electronic device on the aircraft.” Thus, as neither Zicker nor Wright teach or suggest Applicants’ invention as claimed, Applicants assert independent Claim 23 is patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as Claims 22 and 25 depend from either independent Claims 16 or 23, Applicants believe these claims are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zicker and Moore in view of Rautiola (U.S. Pat. No. 5,924,030). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note Claims 12 and 24 depend from either independent Claims 1 or 23. As stated previously, Applicants believe Claims 1 and 23 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claims 12 and 24 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zicker and Moore in view of Wright (U.S. Pat. No. 6,047,165). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note Claims 13 and 14 both depend from independent Claim 1. As stated previously, Applicants believe Claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claims 13 and 14 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 15, 2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

By: 

Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Michael L. Taylor, Reg. No. 50,521

MDE/EKS/ps